DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 186 463 TM 800 165

AUTHOR	Havlicek, Larry L.: Huppee, Barbara A.
TITLE	The Impact of the Title IV-C, ESEA Innovative-Exemplary Program on Education in Kansas. Results from On-Site Visits. Results from Mailed Questionnaires.
INSTITUTION	Kansas Univ., Lawrence. School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Kansas State Dept. of Education, Topeka.
PUB DATE	Jul 79
NOTE	86p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adolescents; Basic Skills; Career Education; Computer Oriented Programs; *Demonstration Programs; *Dropout Prevention; Educational Innovation; Education Service Centers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Programs; Language Arts; Mothers; *Program Effectiveness; Program Implementation; Questionnaires; School Visitation; Severe Disabilities; Slow Learners; *State Surveys; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title IV; Kansas; Piagetian Theory

ABSTRACT

Results are reported from 12 on-site visits and from mailed questionnaire returns regarding the continuing effects of the Elementary Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title IV-C, Innovative Exemplary Program, on education in Kansas. At each district visited, information was obtained, and verified when possible, regarding the changes resulting from the project, the success of the project, the extent of dissemination efforts, the continued use of the project, the funding source, the reasons for its continuation, and the district's awareness of other Title IV-C projects. The projects visited were: Teenage Parents School (TAPS), Arkansas City; Personal and Career Exploration (PACE), Atchison; Piaget in the Classroom (PIC), Buhler; Goal: Language Arts Development (GLAD), Cherokee; Northwest Kansas Educational Cooperative (NKEC), Colby; Project Master, Garden City; Second Time Around for Youth (STAY), Leavenworth; Sequential Planning of Instruction for Career Education (SPICE), Ottawa; Sharing Concern and Opportunities for Relevant Education (SCORE), Russell; Education for the Severely Emotionally Disturbed and Autistic Child (ESED) and Project Product, Shawnee Mission; and Center for Innovative Teaching Experiences (CITE), Wichita. Four hundred of the 1,500 schools in Kansas replied to the questionnaire about their use of these 12 projects. (CTM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE IMPACT OF THE TITLE IV-C, ESEA INNOVATIVE-EXEMPLARY PROGRAM ON EDUCATION IN KANSAS

ED186463

RESULTS FROM ON-SITE VISITS

by

Larry L. Havlicek

RESULTS FROM MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES

by

Barbara A. Huppee

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
N Flott
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Prepared for the

KANSAS STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

by the

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY AND RESEARCH
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

July, 1979

TM800 165

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
PROCEDURE	2
RESULTS FROM ON-SITE VISITS	5
Arkansas City (TAPS)	7
Atchison (PACE)	11
Buhler (PIC)	16
Cherokee (GLAD)	20
Colby (NKEC)	24
Garden City (MASTER)	28
Leavenworth (STAY)	32
Ottawa (SPICE)	36
Russell (SCORE)	40
Shawnee Mission (ESED)	44
Shawnee Mission (PRODUCT)	47
Wichita (CITE)	50
SUMMARY OF ON-SITE VISITS	54
RESULTS FROM MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES	61
APPENDIX	68
Interview Guide	
Mailed Questionnaire	
Cover Letter	

INTRODUCTION

In order to determine the impact of the Title IV-C Innovative-Exemplary Program on education in Kansas, the Department of Educational Psychology and Research at the University of Kansas was commissioned to do a series of studies to determine the extent of carry-on of projects begun under federal funding and to determine what influence these projects had on education in Kansas. The first study was done in 1972. Twenty-one innovative projects which had been in operation for three years under federal funding were studied at that time. The second study was done in 1976 and this study investigated 14 projects which were funded during the fiscal years 1973 through 1975. This study is similar to the two previous studies in both the procedures used and the objectives. Specifically, the objectives of the present study are as follows:

> Ascertain, quantify, and evaluate the relative degree of carry-on of Title IV-C, ESEA projects in the twelve host districts after termination of federal funding (the period of FY's '76, '77, and '78).
>
> Ascertain, quantify, and evaluate the extent to which these projects have benefited or influenced other Kansas school districts.
>
> Ascertain and evaluate by sampling, project personnel's perceptions of how these twelve projects have been helpful to them in their assignments in the school districts.
>
> Identify, document, and evaluate the reasons for success or failure to continue projects upon termination of federal assistance.

FEB 2 6 1980

Identify, document, and evaluate the reasons non-project schools failed to implement aspects of these twelve projects or the reasons for adopting/adapting aspects of these projects.

Identify the extent projects have been adopted by other school districts within Kansas and the extent of adaptation of these projects.

Verify actual operation and continuation of project activities previously carried on under federal funding including: budget allocations, purchases or construction, personnel assignments, assignment of necessary space, facilities, and equipment for program continuation, and use of project materials.

Draw conclusions as to what variables are operating in the respective individual and collective school district projects which would tend to indicate why some projects are deemed successful and others are considered less successful.

PROCEDURE

The procedures used to collect data for this study consisted of on-site visits to each of the twelve host districts during which interviews were conducted with school administrators, former project directors if they were available, teachers, students, and others connected with particular projects. The form used to interview these people is included in the Appendix of this study. In addition to the interview form, an informal observational procedure was used as a procedure to supplement and verify the information obtained during the on-site visit interviews. This was done by visiting with students and teachers who were identified as continuing project activities to determine the extent of use, satisfaction with materials and activities, and to verify actual continuation. Thus, information was collected in

different ways so that cross-checks could be made to determine the reliability of the information being collected. For most of the on-site visits, the researcher was able to visit and observe on-going activities of the projects.

The instrument that was used to collect data pertinent to carry-on of project activities was designed to measure various factors related to carry-on activities as well as the actual extent of carry-on. Thus, information was collected on factors which might be associated with carry-on of project activities.

The procedures for each on-site visit were followed as closely as possible. However, in some instances, it was not possible to follow the exact procedures. For example, in some instances the former project director was not available for an interview. In some cases insufficient information was available to either substantiate a claim of project continuation or to document specific information, e.g., budget estimates or per cent of project carry-on. For some projects in which a number of schools were involved, it was not possible to visit all of the schools. However, in most cases the information obtained was verified through observation or actual documentation, e.g., review of the published school budget and/or personnel rosters. During the on-site visit to each host district, the researcher visited with enough personnel in the respective districts to verify that most of the information about project continuation was accurate. Since the procedure varied during each on-site visit, a brief description of on-site activities will be in-

cluded with the findings for each project.

In order to determine the extent to which these projects have benefited or influenced other Kansas school districts, a mailed questionnaire was sent to all school principals in Kansas to determine whether or not these principals were aware of the 12 projects, had visited any of the projects, or had implemented any of the concepts, methods, materials, or procedures from any of the 12 projects. The questionnaire used for this aspect of the study is also included in the Appendix.

The results of this study are presented in two major sections. The first part will present the results of the on-site visits to the 12 host districts to determine the extent of carry-on activities and factors associated with carry-on considerations in each of the school districts which had received federal funds for projects. The second part will present the results of the mailed questionnaires to all of the principals in the State of Kansas to determine the extent of impact on education in Kansas in all schools.

RESULTS FROM ON-SITE VISITS

Thirty-four questions were used to collect data during the on-site visits to the 12 host districts. The survey form is contained in Appendix A of this report. The 34 questions were used to interview former project directors, current school administrators, teachers involved with project continuation, and students. The questions served as the basis for making informal observations regarding project continuation, i.e., to verify the information collected during the interviews. Thus, in most cases the information presented in this report has been verified through actual observation of on-going program activity. For the presentation of the results of these interviews and on-site visits, the questions will be grouped according to the following seven areas.

1. Changes in LEA. Changes brought about in the district as a result of the ESEA, Title IV-C Project in that district. Information from questions 1, 4, and 7 will be compiled as a summarization of the changes brought about in the district due to the project as well as information obtained from teachers and informal observations. This data relates to the third objective of the study -- to determine how these 12 projects have been helpful to local personnel in the school districts.

2. Effectiveness/Success. Effectiveness of the project and the extent to which the project met the identified learner needs in the school district will be compiled, mainly from Items 2 and 3 from the interview form as well as from information collected from informal observations. This data also relates to the

third objective of the study.

3. Exportability. Items 17, 18, and 19 will be summarized to present the dissemination efforts and known users of the project. This information relates directly to objective 6 of the study -- to determine the extent projects have been adopted by other school districts in Kansas.

4. Continued Use. Information from items 20 through 26 will be compiled and summarized to indicate continuation activities of the various projects. The information obtained from observations with teachers and students will also be included. This information relates directly to objectives 1 and 7 of the study -- to determine the relative degree of carry-on of the projects and to verify actual operation and continuation.

5. Funding. Information regarding present funding levels of project continuation will be presented, mainly from items 22 and 26 of the survey form. This information also relates to objective 7 of the study.

6. Factors related to Continuation. Items 8 through 16 and 27, 28, and 29 will be summarized regarding factors related to continuation of projects. These items relate to objectives 4 and 8 of the study -- to identify and evaluate the reasons for success or failure to continue projects and to draw conclusions regarding what variables are operating in the respective districts pertinent to project continuation.

7. Awareness and Use of Other Projects. Information from items 30 through 3[illegible] will be summarized concerning awareness and

use of other Title IV-C projects. Also, comments concerning the ESEA Title IV-C program in the State of Xansas will be summarized.

ARKANSAS CITY - TEENAGE PARENTS SCHOOL (TAPS)

On-Site Procedures. During the on-site visit, the researcher visited with the assistant superintendent of schools, the principal of the high school, and the counselor who is also the director of the alternative school. The business manager was also contacted regarding the budget for the alternative school. The researcher toured the room and facilities used for the alternative school and checked through the rosters for attendance at this school. Since this program was for students to attend evening classes, no students were available for interviews. However, the researcher reviewed the operating procedures for the alternative school and a description of the alternative program. The school library was also checked since this is where the materials from the project are housed.

1. Changes in LEA. The TAPS project was the basis for the present alternative program which caters to teenage parents and others who have dropped out of high school. As indicated by the high school principal, the alternative program would not have been started without the impetus of Project TAPS. At the present time, the emphasis is to keep teenage parents in the regular school, although the alternative school is an option for these students. This school meets twice a week in the

evenings and presently around 15 students are enrolled. Most of the instruction is on an individual basis, similar to the TAPS program during the federal funding phase. Currently two teachers are directly involved, with supporting personnel such as English and Social Studies teachers as well as the school librarian. The program uses regular teaching materials available through the regular high school program plus project materials which were left over from the project, mainly reference materials and reading materials. The district is providing a room in the high school for the program as well as desks and chairs. The Rules and Regularions Governing the Alternative School are available for interested students and an Alternative School Committee has been established to act as a governing board for the school. Thus, the main changes brought about due to the project was that this was the basis for the alternative program currently on-going in the LEA.

2. Effectiveness/Success. The main objectives for Project TAPS was to develop programs for teen-aged mothers and fathers, improve self-concepts of these students, and to develop better parents. The program also focused on the following Kansas learner needs from the SEEK study: develop positive self-impage, develop learning patterns, strengthen programs for non-college bound youth, develop programs for dropouts, develop positive attitude toward quality education, develop more effective student evaluation and assessment, and to provide meaningful involvement in learning situations. Little or no information was available to judge the effectiveness/success

of the project. As indicated by local school personnel, no program was developed for teen-aged mothers or fathers and no specific parenting program was developed. Thus, it appears that the project was not very effective in meeting its objectives. Thus, since very little information is available, it appears that the project was not very effective in meeting its objectives.

3. Exportability. Since the project director was not available for interviewing, nor any other project staff, it was not known exactly how much dissemination was done during the project funding period. A brochure was prepared and sent out during project funding, but these are not sent out at the present time. None of the people interviewed were aware of any recent inquiries from other school districts about Project TAPS, nor were they aware of any other school districts using aspects of the project. Thus, it appears that there are no dissemination activities at the present time.

4. Continued Use. Since as stated above, no parenting program was actually developed during the federal funding phase of the program, this aspect of the project is not being continued. Some aspects of the project are still being used. For example, the library purchased with federal funds has been incorporated into the regular high school library and these materials are still being used. The individualized aspect of the program is still being used in the present alternative program, but this is a concept that is not the direct result of Project TAPS. At the present time, the current alternative

school has about 15 students enrolled. Two high school guidance counselors and the school librarian are involved with the present program which meets two nights a week for a total of five hours per week. Thus, it appears that a related program is being continued at the present time to serve basically the same population that was served by Project TAPS. However, this program is more closely tied into the regular high school program than was Project TAPS. As indicated by local school personnel, it would be fair to state that Project TAPS was the basis and impetus for the present alternative school program and that some of the resource materials from the project are still being used. However, the original concept program of Project TAPS is not being continued as it was during the federal funding period.

5. Funding. At the present time the business manager for the district indicated that approximately $20,000 was being spent each year to operate the alternative school. This covers the present staff on a .33 to .50 staff load, expenses for materials, and use of the present facilities. This compares to $51,276 which was the budget during the final year of federal funding.

6. Factors Related to Continuation. Little information was available pertinent to project continuation. As indicated above, the program is being continued in a different way and about the only real continued carry-on is the use of the materials purchased during the federal funding period. Present school personnel indicated that the TAPS program was fairly much isolated

from the regular programs in the high school and there were few contacts with regular staff. Thus, communication with the regular high school staff was a problem and was such that the program was rather isolated and the regular teachers did not know what was going on in that program. There also were some philosophical problems regarding how the program was being managed and this also probably led to further isolation. Thus it appears that the regular staff had little input or knowledge about the TAPS program and had little participation with the project. These factors plus the fact that there was very little information about the program or its effectiveness were probably factors which influenced the lack of continuation of the project.

7. Awareness and Use of Other Projects. Little information was provided with regard to other Title IV-C projects being used in the district. Thus, it appears that limited knowledge about or use of other projects is descriptive of the district at the present time. No comments were provided concerning the ESEA Title IV-C program in Kansas.

ATCHISON - PERSONAL AND CAREER EXPLORATION (PACE)

On-Site Procedures. During the on-site visit, the superintendent of schools, the business manager, the director of special education, the junior high school principal, and the project director were interviewed. A tour of the project facilities was also made, however, since school was not in session, it was not possible to observe classes in process.

However, the rooms used to continue the project and the equipment used in the project were inspected. All of the equipment and materials purchased during federal funding is still being used for project continuation. The same facilities are being provided as they were during federal funding. Thus, the facilities are the same as they were during the federal funding period.

1. Changes in LEA. Many changes due to the project were identified during the on-site visit. The program is now required of all special education students. In fact, due to the project the entire special education program has been restructured. Students learn more about themselves and about vocations, and are able to match their talents to the various vocations. Many students have continued in school due to the program and have benefited in making excellent progress towards developing their career potentials. In addition to students, other teachers, parents, and other school personnel have been influenced by the project. Thus, Project PACE has brought about a change in the special education program of the district that can now serve special education students in a more beneficial way.

2. Effectiveness/Success. The program is viewed as being very successful and effective. The objectives of the project were to develop effective career awareness and exploration components, an effective guidance component for handicapped youth, and a work experience laboratory. All of these objectives have been met and are being carried on in the same way as during

federal funding. The school benefits from having this curriculum area which was highly needed. For special education students the practical area of hands-on experience helps to develop the self-concept of special education students. Project PACE provided the basis for this integral program which provides a program which can save many of these students from dropping out of school. The school district is now considering these same procedures and curriculum for non-special education students. Thus, the project is considered as being very effective and successful by district personnel, and from the evidence gathered during the on-site visit, it appears that the program has been very effective and successful.

3. Exportability. A brochure and slide-tape presentation were used to disseminate information about the project during the federal funding period. The project director still gets a few inquiries about the project from other school districts. None of the local personnel are aware of any other school districts who have adopted/adapted aspects of Project PACE.

4. Continued Use. All aspects of the project are continuing with regard to the curriculum and the emphases of the program, that is, to provide hands-on experience for students to gain knowledge of careers and to explor their possibilities in various careers. Staffing is at a 75 per cent level since the Industrial Arts position could not be filled. Several who were interviewed indicated that this position would have been filled had they been able to find a replacement.

Staff and materials are still being used in the same way that they were used during federal funding. Since the school has been reorganized, the sixth grade was dropped. Thus, the total number of students being served has dropped. However, next year the program will be expanded to include non-public students. At the present time the project is being continued with two professional staff and two para-professionals. About the same number of students are involved with the program now as during the federal funding period. Thus, it appears that the program is being continued at about the same level as during the federal funding period.

5. Funding. According to the business manager, $33,000 is currently being spent to continue program operations. About $30,000 is for salaries and the rest for supplies. Since there are two professionals and two para-professionals employed to continue the program, the amount indicated seems to be accurate.

6. Factors Related to Continuation. It appears that all of the local personnel -- superintendent, Board of Education, other teachers, students, etc. -- were in favor of continuation of the project. The total staff was supportive of the project and there appears to be a high level of support and enthusiasm for the project during the federal funding period. The administration was highly supportive, and were involved with many of the decisions regarding the project during the federal funding period. Special workshops were provided for regular teachers so that they were aware of the project and its purposes. Training of

both project and regular teachers was continuous over the period of the project. Outside consultants were used for this training. During the funding period as well as now, regular teachers were made aware of the curriculum and how it could serve the students of these teachers. Thus, a high degree of cooperation took place between regular teachers and project staff and project program. The principal of the junior high school was very much in favor of the program and was active in working closely with the program. Thus, it appears that the project met a definite need and school personnel recognized the program as meeting those needs. Thus the total positive regard for the program and the need for it to continue. This plus the close working relationship between project and regular staff were factors instrumental in project continuation.

7. Awareness and Use of Other Projects. District personnel are aware of several other Title IV-C projects, and presently have had direct contact with Projects COST and the Media Literacy Projects. However, none of these concepts have been implemented in the LEA at the present time. Title IV-C Program in Kansas is viewed as a viable program to improve education in the State. However, costs of carry-on for many of the programs or to adopt/adapt many of the programs is such that it is difficult to implement. However, the general concensus is that many valuable programs have been started through the efforts of Title III and Title IV-C in Kansas.

BUHLER - PIAGET IN THE CLASSROOM (PIC)

On-Site Procedures. During the on-site visit, interviews were held with the superintendent, the assistant superintendent in charge of curriculum, and two teachers who are continuing to use PIC materials and concepts. Also visited with the media librarian who is in charge of checking out PIC materials. Since school was not in session, it was not possible to observe any classrooms. However, a review was made of the use of PIC materials that have been checked out to teachers from the library where these materials are deposited.

1. Changes in LEA. Most of the changes brought about by Project PIC were for individual teachers. The Project upgraded teachers to use new and better things in their teaching and to upgrade their curriculum. Teachers were made aware of many new high quality materials and they moved away from regular textbooks to using many other kinds of concepts and ideas in their teaching. Much of this thinking has carried over into the high school. The idea of the work centers changed the thinking of many teachers. The materials and ideas from the project are still being used by teachers. There has also been an influence on parents and administrators in the district, both of these groups receptive to the ideas espoused by the project, especially as these concepts relate to the gifted students. Thus, the changes that were brought about due to Project PIC have been mainly on an individual basis for teachers in the system.

2. Effectiveness Success. The main project objective of getting teachers to know and implement Piaget's theories of cognitive development were met according to the individuals who were interviewed. Also the Kansas identified learner needs of developing learning patterns based upon student needs and to train teachers in motivating students were considered as having been met. Thus local school personnel feel that the project was very successful in teaching teachers how to motivate students to learn, use learning patterns based upon student needs, and to implement Piaget's concepts. The project made it possible for teachers to use new and different materials, and these materials are still being used by teachers in the district. The work center concept for teachers was deemed very beneficial and is still used. The district personnel feel that students have benefited from the "hands-on" experience as much as teachers have benefited. The project made it possible to provide this kind of experience. Thus, local personnel feel that the project was very effective in getting teachers to change their methods of teaching and to incorporate new concepts, ideas, and materials into their curriculum.

3. Exportability. Present school personnel did not know the extent to which dissemination activities took place during the federal funding phase, but did indicate that they still get inquiries from other school districts about the project. A brochure and a slide-tape presentation are still available for dissemination purposes. Larned, Halstead, and a school district in Atlanta were schools listed as using aspects of Project PIC.

4. Continued Use. Although there is no formal continuation of the project on a district-wide or school basis, the project is being continued on an individual basis by many of the teachers involved with the project. Many teachers still request and use Project PIC materials. The filmstrip camera, laminator, and a high percentage of the materials from the project are still being used in the schools by individual teachers. The project's concepts and materials are still emphasized at teachers meetings. Thus, the local district advocates the use of the concepts and materials. About the same number of students probably are involved with classroom activities based upon PIC's ideas and materials although the involvement may not be as extensive as it was during the duration of the project. However, some of the materials have been exhausted and evidently have not been replaced. Thus, it appears that as long as the materials are available and as long as there are teachers who were involved in the project during federal funding, Project PIC's concepts and ideas will be continued to be used. However, since there is no formal budget for the program, project continuation may only last as long as the materials.

5. Funding. There is no budget for project continuation and no staff have been retained for continuation of the project. Materials are made available to teachers to use if they are available. However, it does not appear that the district is supporting the project through any budget allotment.

6. Factors Related to Continuation. It appears that there was a high degree of teacher involvement during the federal

funding phase and this included the principals of the various schools. The director of the project was viewed as being very effective in working with teachers, staff, and the administration. It appears that there was also quite a bit of "grass roots" type of involvement in that teachers could work on materials directly related to their teaching. Thus, the ideas and concepts had a great deal of practicality, and there was much classroom assistance provided which was highly relevant. In fact, it is due to this type of involvement that there is as much continuation as there is since individual teachers received much needed help from the project. It is unfortunate that due to the Director's death and lack of funds that the project is not being continued on a formal basis. It is the feeling of this researcher that these two factors were the most influential for not continuing the project on a formal basis. The teachers and librarian interviewed were very enthusiastic about the project and indicated that many other teachers shared their enthusiasm. Thus, this is a situation in which there were excellent relationships among project staff, teachers, and administration during the federal funding phase and that the project was providing relevant involvement for teachers. However, after federal funding without direct leadership the program was not supported directly by the administration.

7. Awareness and Use of Other Projects. Local personnel were familiar with several other Title IV-C projects, those mentioned being Talents Unlimited, Murdock Learning Center in

Wichita, and the KEDDS mini grant applications. Talents Unlimited program is being implemented in the district. Comments made concerning the ESEA Title IV-C program in Kansas was that this was a good way to bring teachers together and to bring new concepts to education.

CHEROKEE - GOAL: LANGUAGE ARTS DEVELOPMENT (GLAD)

On-Site Procedures. During the on-site visit, the researcher visited with the superintendent about the carry-on of Project GLAD and read eight letters from teachers who indicated that they were still using GLAD concepts in their classrooms. Since school was not in session, it was not possible to observe any of the teachers using GLAD concepts in their classrooms.

1. Changes in LEA. Several changes in the local district came about due to Project GLAD. The district now has a full-time speech therapist and a half-time school psychologist. The district did not have these before the project. The district now emphasizes individual learning more than before the project. Use of student tutors and use of student created "story book" are other aspects brought about by the project. Also, aides are now hired by the district. Thus, a number of changes were brought about due to the project according to the superintendent.

2. Effectiveness/Success. The three main goals of the project were met according to the superintendent. These were to (1) increase students' language arts, (2) develop a student-

centered, activity-based curriculum, and (3) to assess entry level skills of students. In addition to these three goals, two SEEK needs were met: early diagnosis of learning problems and development of learning patterns based on student needs. No data was available to document the indication that all of the project's goals were met. However, the fact that the program is being continued on a limited basis would indicate that local administration thought the program was effective. Mention was made that there was an improvement of test scores from beginning to the end of the project.

3. Exportability. Two brochures and two slide-tape presentations were used for disseminating ideas about the project. Several districts were sent information about the project and specifically Coffeyville and Kansas City were sent information about the project. Several school districts have visited the project and may be using some of the concepts from Project GLAD. Within the past year several school districts have requested information about the project. Thus, there is still interest in the project from other school districts.

4. Continued Use. It was estimated that approximately 60 per cent of the project is being continued, mainly on an individual teacher basis. No formal program is being continued, and it was noted that the director has left the district. During the federal funding period, there were about 60 teachers involved in the project and with an average class size of 22 students, there would have been around 1,320 students involved with the project. At the present time it was estimated that about 800

students are currently involved in some way with continuation activities. Individual teachers seem to continue to use concepts and aspects of the program as indicated in the letters sent in to the superintendent describing their carry-on of project activities. Some of the aspects that they indicated they still were using from the project are: brainstorming, reading centers, learning centers, various learning games, listening centers, math areas, creative writing, A-V materials, tape recorder, oral language, journal writing, and "roots" project. It was indicated that two principals are still using and purchasing equipment to continue GLAD activities and concepts. One principal was said to have changed his philosophy of education for his school and now uses more individual instruction. Thus, the program is being continued mainly on an individual basis with no formal program in the district. The GLAD project is mentioned at teachers' meetings and information about what is available is provided to new as well as returning teachers.

5. Funding. At the present time the superintendent indicated that the budget for GLAD continuation was approximately $45,000 per year. However, no breakdown was provided as to how this money was spent except that the district now hires a full time speech therapist and a half-time school psychologist. All of the funds come from the regular budget for the district. Approximately $7,000 of this amount was spent for materials to continue the project.

6. Factors Related to Continuation. It appears that there was a high level of teacher involvement in all aspects of the

project from ideas for the original grant application through implementation during federal funding and project continuation thereafter. Many of the materials that were used in the project were developed locally by classroom teachers and their students. Thus the teachers had a high degree of involvement in many aspects of the project. Also, many of the principals were active in the project since many of these served a dual function of being both principal and a teacher in their school. There was also an active advisory group of 1 or 2 teachers from each building. Thus, there was a lot of involvement on the part of teachers in the project. Possibly this is one of the main reasons individual teachers are continuing to use aspects and materials from the project. Also in-service training was provided for teachers and this was continuous over the duration of the project. This training provided the teachers with help in creating materials to use in their classrooms. Again, this is a factor which would be important for project continuation. Administrative support for the project both during the federal funding phase and during continuation was described as being very positive.

7. Awareness and Use of Other Projects. The superintendent indicated that he was aware of several other projects mainly through brochures which were sent to the district from other projects. No indication was made as to whether or not any of these concepts were implemented. Thus, it appears that none of the concepts from other projects have been incorporated into the district. The only comment made concerning the Title

IV-C program in Kansas was that too much money was spent for evaluation of these programs, that this money could be spent for expanding the program - buying more materials.

COLBY - NORTHWEST KANSAS EDUCATIONAL COOPERATIVE (NKEC)

On-Site Procedures. During the on-site visits, interviews were conducted with the superintendent, the Director of the Educational Cooperative, four of the specialists in the Center, and toured the facilities of the Cooperative. Records of activities of the Cooperative were reviewed including records of usage of materials, equipment, and consultants. Also informative literature describing the Cooperative and its services were reviewed.

1. Changes in LEA. The NKEC Project provided the vehicle to set the foundation for the Educational Cooperative. As described by the superintendent, the project provided the catalyst for developing a functional cooperative. The Project provided services for 22 schools in the area which would not have been provided otherwise. All school personnel in the area were influenced by the project since the project involved nearly all aspects of each school district. The project also brought about closer communication among the 22 school districts in that area. Thus, the changes brought about due to the project were closer communication among districts, and greatly expanded services to the schools in the form of the Educational Cooperative.

2. Effectiveness/Success. The main objective of the project was to develop a model regional supplemental service center. All

school personnel interviewed indicated that the project was very successful in formulating such a service center. SEEK needs which were identified by the project were to develop learning patterns based upon student needs and teacher training in student motivation. Both of these needs were met as far as local staff were concerned. The fact that the service center has been greatly expanded testifies to the effectiveness/success of the project. Twenty of the original twenty-two districts are still involved with the center. Thus, the project has been very successful in developing a regional supplemental service center and providing needed services to schools served by the Cooperative.

3. Exportability. Dissemination is still being carried out via brochures and slide-tape presentations. The slide-tape has been up-dated to reflect expansion of the services provided by the Cooperative. Many of the staff of the Cooperative have visited other schools to describe the services available. About ten inquiries are received each year since federal funding from other school districts about the project. The superintendent has talked to the Kansas Commissioner of Education about establishing a state-wide regional service center or centers, via regional agencies. The South-east Regional Educational Service Center was set up on many of the principles used by this project, and close cooperation has been maintained with this center. Other school districts have visited the Cooperative, especially those interested in setting up a similar cooperative in the areas of special education and vocational education.

4. Continued Use. The center has greatly expanded its services and staff. All programs are being continued including an additional migrant education component. At the present time there are over 100 full and part time staff at the Cooperative, 30 out of the central office in Colby. There is the equivalent to 22 full-time staff for the Cooperative. Thus all aspects of the center are being continued and have been greatly expanded. The total number of students served by the Cooperative is probably greater since more services are provided. Likewise there is a greater number of teachers involved.

5. Funding. Funding for the Educational Cooperative has greatly expanded. The Director of the Cooperative indicated that their total budget was $1,250,000, with 196,000 coming from assessments paid by schools being served by the Cooperative. Colby's assessment for the present year is $89,000, according to the superintendent. Base fee for each district served is $16,600. Present funding compares to $73,000 during the last year of federal funding. Thus, the budget for the Cooperative is much more than during the federal funding period.

6. Factors Related to Continuation. The superintendents of the cooperative schools appear to have had the most influence for the project's continuation. This group of superintendents serve as the advisory board for the Cooperative, and evidently were very impressed with the services and wanted to expand them. The NKEC staff also played an important part in continuation. Thus, it appears that the center met a very definite need for these

school districts and this was probably the main reason for continuation of such services. Also, there appears to be a high level of involvement of both teachers and administrators in the Cooperative's activities and services. There appears to be a very satisfactory communication network among Cooperative Center staff, teachers, and administrators. Teachers have an input as to what they need and what services should be provided. The school administrators are involved in all decisions regarding needs and services provided. Thus, the relationships among project staff, teachers, and administrators could be regarded as excellent. Since the Cooperative seems to provide needed services, it appears that it will continue for a long time.

7. Awareness and Use of Other Projects. The district is very active incorporating other Title IV-C projects in their district. Through a small grant through KEDDS they are incorporating precision teaching into their system, teachers and administrators have visited such programs at Great Falls, Montana and in Denver. They are also thinking about implementing Project ACTIVE, an RRR Project out of Kearney, Nebraska, the Shawnee-Mission Precision Teaching project, the Art in the Elementary School program out of Wichita, Project Master out of Garden City, IEP programs, instructional TV, and other projects. They are in the process of writing an Instructional TV grant for centralizing TV production and setting up a distribution center for such programs. They are also thinking about a computerized managed educational system for their rural area. Thus, the district is very active in seeking and using other projects.

GARDEN CITY - PROJECT MASTER

On-Site Procedures. During the on-site visit, interviews were held with the superintendent, the director of curriculum, the present director of the computer assisted facility, the teacher's aide, several students in a computer class, and observed two classes in session using the computer facility. The researcher also worked through a unit on the computer terminal for "hands on" experience with the system.

1. Changes in LEA. Project MASTER provided the basis for the computer managed instructional center in the school district. Since the computer center was established, there has been a greater understanding of computerized learning throughout the district for teachers, administrators, and students. The teachers and administrators became aware of computerized learning through inservice training provided by the project. In addition to using the computer for instructional purposes, the district has a computerized library catalogue system similar to ERIC, have used the computer for scheduling of classes, for developing report cards, and for general accounting purposes. Thus, the project was the basis for using the computer for not only instructional purposes but also for administrative and other purposes.

2. Effectiveness/Success. The project has been deemed effective and successful by local administrators and the present director of the computerized learning center. The main objectives of the project -- improve problem solving skills, improve math achievement and attitudes -- have been met. However, this is

mainly a subjective judgment since it appears that little data was available to substantiate this opinion. However, since the district continues to support the center evidently the local administration is satisified enough to continue to operate the computer center. In fact, the computerized learning aspect as well as the administrative functions have been expanded. With regard to the SEEK identified needs -- more meaningful student involvement in learning situations, more effective student evaluation and assessment of achievement, strengthen programs for noncollege bound students, and to develop learning patterns based upon student needs -- all were judged to have been met to some degree by the project. It was noted that attendance has held up in the computerized classes and the number of classes is being expanded to included more areas each year. Thus, the local school personnel appear to be satisfied with the computerized learning center and feel that it has been effective and successful.

3. Exportability. Little information was provided concerning dissemination since the director of the project during federal funding was not available and others were not aware of how much dissemination was done during that period. A brochure is still available for dissemination and the district has gotten around 100 inquiries about the program during the past year. Several districts from the area have visited the program and have expressed an interest in incorporating similar programs. Thus, dissemination of information about the program is still being done.

4. Continued Use. According to the present director of the computerized learning center, the program has expanded since the

federal funding period. The program has increased from just serving the math area to English, physics, biology, FFA, home economics, and computer programming. Also in the elementary schools Project IMPACT is being put on the computer for instructional purposes. Also the use of the computer has been expanded in the administrative area since now the computer is used for report cards, class scheduling, and general accounting. Also a computerized library card system has been developed. Thus it appears that the computer center has been expanded with regard to the use of the computer. Also mention should be made that the software, the number of programs available, has also been greatly expanded.

5. Funding. Present funding for the computer center is $25,000 per year. This includes the salaries for the present director and an aide. The balance is spent on supplies and computer upkeep. All of the present funding is from local funds. During the last year of the federal funding phase, the budget was $53,000.

6. Factors Related to Continuation. It was difficult to determine who or what had the most influence for continuation of the program. The fact that 65 high school teachers were aware of the program and were given training on how to utilize the computer for instructional purposes as well as nearly 100 elementary and junior high school teachers, possibly had an impact on continuing the center. Also the fact that the computer is being used for administrative uses probably had an influence on continuing the center. What with the computerized library

system, the report card system, and other administrative uses of the computer, possibly the district found that it was economically feasible to keep the computer center going. Thus, it appears that a combination of administrative uses for the computer and the fact that several teachers had developed and were using computerized learning programs kept the center going. Since there have been at least three directors of the center since it was established, possibly the administration of the district had the most influence in keeping the program going.

7. Awareness and Use of Other Projects. The district is active in seeking other projects to incorporate into their system. During the past year, teachers and/or administrators took three trips for the "Every Child a Winner" program and made ten presentations on this program in other schools. They have also sent 5 teachers to a week-long language arts training program at Austin, Texas. There is also a trainer in the district for "Every Child a Winner", one of the KEDDS programs. They are also utilizing 9 other programs distributed by KEDDS. With regard to the ESEA Title IV-C program in Kansas, the local personnel was very favorable. One suggestion was that the Guidelines should have a listing of past projects to give examples of the types of projects that have been funded in the past. They feel that the Title IV-C program is unbiased and unpolitical, and have been very satisfied with the program.

LEAVENWORTH - SECOND TIME AROUND FOR YOUTH (STAY)

On-Site Procedures. During the on-site visit, interviews were conducted with the superintendent of schools, the new director of the program, the former director of the program, two teachers teaching in the program, several students in on-going classes, and an assistant principal. The new and expanded facilities housing the on-going program were visited as were two classes. The records of attendance, courses taught, and completions of high school were also checked.

1. Changes in LEA. The district is now able to provide for potential drop-outs and to provide options for regular students, i.e., to provide specific courses which might be needed for graduation or to provide an alternative course for one which might cause the student to dropout of school. Also provides an opportunity to provide a high school education for young adults in the community, adults who would not return to regular high school, e.g., young women with children or those in the community without a high school diploma but would like to obtain one but do not want to go back to regular school. There has been a reduced dropout rate because of the program and more evidence of caring about students. The program was the basis for a night program for adults in the community who wanted to finish high school. Work-study options and credit for work to count towards graduation were also concepts started by the project. The project also had a positive influence on relations with parents and the community. The community is now more

accepting of the alternative school concept and there is a closer working relationship between the school and the community.

2. Effectiveness/Success. The program has been deemed to be very effective and successful. Evidence that the dropout rate has been reduced and that many potential dropouts have finished high school was provided. The project was very effective in meetings its objectives: to motivate students to complete high school, develop a teaching team for potential drop-outs, and to provide such education at equal costs as the regular program. However, the latter was only partially met since the program is slightly more expensive than the regular program on a per pupil basis. The project was definitely viewed as meeting the SEEK need of providing a program for potential dropouts, unmotivated students, or alienated students. Thus, the program is viewed as being very effective and successful by local staff.

3. Exportability. The former director indicated that approximately 20 per cent of his effort was directed towards dissemination of the project. This was through public speaking in and out of the local community, attending meetings, and contacts with the local newspapers and other mass media. A brochure about the project was sent to all schools in Kansas. About six inquiries from area schools are still received per year about the project. Several schools have sent staff to visit the program. However, it is not known whether or not these schools have implemented any of the concepts into their systems.

4. Continued Use. All aspects of the project and all concepts are being continued. The project has been moved to a newer and larger facility which has improved the setting for the program. Staffing has remained at the same level, and the number of students served has increased. The program has increased both with regard to the number of students served directly and also due to a concurrent enrollment procedure with the regular high school. About 47 students are enrolled directly in the program and 90 more are concurrently enrolled with the regular high school, i.e., they are taking a course or two through the alternative program. The same type of classes and the same type of services are provided now as during the federal funding period.

5. Funding. Approximately $90,000 is the budget for the past year compared to $60,700 during the last year of federal funding. This budget supports the same number of staff members as during the federal funding period plus paying for the expanded facility. All of the funds are from local budget allocations.

6. Factors Related to Continuation. The former and present project director and two or three key board members were the most influencial for the project's continuation. The project met an obvious need to reduce the dropout rate and to deal with potential dropouts. Thus the success of the project in meeting a definite need plus key personnel were factors related to continuation of the project. During the federal funding phase of the project there was an emphasis on communication with the public and local business with regard to the objectives and accomplishments of the

project as well as with teachers. The counselors of the high school were kept involved with the project and are still involved. Thus, the close working relationship with teachers and counselors probably played an important part in project continuation. The only concern about continuation was the per pupil costs of the project. Otherwise, the administration, the local board, teachers, and counselors were in favor of the project being continued. Also, it appears that students had some input as to whether or not the program was continued. The success of the program and the fact that the community could see that many of the potential dropouts were completing high school probably had an important inpact on continuation.

7. Awareness and Use of Other Projects. Local school staff are aware of and have actively become involved with a number of other projects. Visits have been made to the "Preventive Early Childhood Failure Program" and "Talents Unlimited". Contact has been made with KEDDS and several of their programs have been considered. The curriculum director in the district and the director of special education have been active in looking at new programs for the district. With regard to comments about the ESEA Title IV-C program in Kansas, local staff felt that the program was very good in that this provided "seed money" for new programs that would probably not be tried without these funds. Possibly some districts are cautious about starting new programs because of the long-term costs involved. Thus the feeling was that many programs are probably not adopted due to local conservative attitudes.

OTTAWA - SEQUENTIAL PLANNING OF INSTRUCTION FOR CAREER EDUCATION (SPICE)

On-Site Procedures. During the on-site visit, interviews were conducted with the superintendent, the curriculum director, the project director, the high school principal, teachers, and counselors involved with the project. Visits were made to two of the elementary schools which house counselors still involved with SPICE activities, as well as the high school.

1. Changes in LEA. The main changes brought about by the project were an increased awareness and emphasis on the value of work and career education throughout the school system. This has been accomplished by the additional counselors hired at the elementary level and the existing counselors at the junior high and high school levels. There has been an increased emphasis on the non-college bound student and in meeting these students' needs. The counseling services at all levels has been improved. Teachers now have an increased awareness of careers and more field trips are geared toward career education. There is a greater emphasis on meeting the student's needs through the district vocational education cooperative. The project also had a side effect of encouraging and fostering individual faculty research, the project having set a very positive example of what can be done through this approach. There has also been an improvement of relationships with the community and local involvement of business and industrial personnel. The project also brought about a higher level of coordination among the district's K through 12 counselors and special education department.

2. Effectiveness/Success. The objectives of the project to plan and develop a K-12 career education program and to implement this program has been accomplished according to the director and superintendent. Also, the identified SEEK needs were met: to renew efforts to develop learning patterns based on student needs, strengthen programs for noncollege-bound students, and to develop programs for potential dropouts and unmotivated students.

3. Exportability. Brochures, newsletters, and a slide-tape presentation were used to disseminate information about the project. These were sent to all schools in Kansas, and the slide-tape presentation was made at various meetings in the State. The newsletter is still being distributed. At the present time around 20 inquiries per year are received about the project. The director still works closely with the Kansas Department of Education in the area of career education, and distributes information about the project through the State Department of Education. In addition, many people from other school districts visited the project. The director assumes that many other districts are using concepts and aspects of Project SPICE.

4.Continued Use. It was estimated that around 80 to 90 per cent of the concepts and aspects of the project are being continued at the present time. The size of the staff has remained the same, as the district continues to hire the elementary counselors. In addition a full-time media specialist has been added to the staff and spends half of her time with continuation

activities for Project SPICE. All of the concepts and materials produced by the project are used to some degree. About the same number of students are involved with continuation activities as there were during the federal funding period. There are some non-public schools involved, and about 90 students from these schools are involved. Thus, the project is being continued in a similar way as during the federal funding period.

5. Funding. At the present time approximately $65,000 is being spent from local funds to continue the project. This compares to a budget of $89,831 during the final year of the project. The budget supports 5½ people, field trips, and materials to continue the project.

6. Factors Related to Continuation. The director of the project probably had the most influence in continuation of the project. Closely related were such factors as the fact that many materials and continuous inservice training was provided to the teachers in the district. Field trips and speakers were also provided. Thus, the local teachers received a lot of assistance from the project--assistance which they felt was very helpful to them and thus something that they wanted to continue receiving. Many activities were provided for the local teachers in the area of career education, and thus this relieved these teachers from having to provide for this in their classrooms or provided help to them in the form of materials, concepts and activities. Thus, the teachers could teach these career education concepts in their classes with a lot of assistance provided by Project SPICE. Also, principals were involved early in the

formulation of the project and continued to be involved for the duration of the project. This was also probably a factor in project continuation. The principals were directly involved in the inservice training. Teachers also had a role in the decision making process at all stages of the project. Teachers had input in the development of materials, in formulating field trips, and served on the advisory board. An active staff and a director who attended Board of Education meetings and who had close contact with teachers, administration, and the community all were factors in project continuation. Thus, a number of factors probably were influential in project continuation as indicated above plus the need for elementary counselors in the district.

7. Awareness and Use of Other Projects. The district is involved in a number of other projects such as TAPS, MASTER, U-SAIL, STAY, and ESED. Active contacts with Project KEDDS, as well as contacts with other organizations in Kansas such as USA, KNEA, and the School Board Association. Also active with Kansas State Department of Education, especially the vocational education section. ACTIVE and U-SAIL are being implemented in the district. Most of these projects were brought to the district's attention through on-site visits or direct contact. The administration feels that brochures are not effective in communicating information about a project. Comments made about ESEA Title IV-C in Kansas were that the program is fair and rational, and that they are comfortable with

the way that the program is run. Suggestions were to try to get more people aware of the program and to apply for funds. Possibly the guidelines could be changed and a guide could be developed for new directors of projects. Local staff felt that the on-site visitation team was very helpful and provided much assistance for the project. All of the local staff were supportive of the program and hoped that it would continue.

RUSSELL - SHARING CONCERN AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR RELEVENT EDUCATION (SCORE)

On-Site Procedures. During the on-site visit, interviews were conducted with the assistant superintendent in charge of all school programs, the principal of the middle school, and two teachers and an aide who are teaching in the program. The classrooms were toured and SCORE classes in operation were observed.

1. Changes in LEA. Several changes in the district can be attributed to the project. The growth rate of the target students have improved from approximately two months per year to nearly a full year's growth in a year. Retention rate and the self-image of the SCORE students is much better now. The student's basic knowledge has improved. There is better communication among teachers, especially math and language teachers, and changed the thinking of most teachers in a positive way. The program has had an influence at the high school level in that the curriculum has moved more toward basic English and math. The project demonstrated that something can be done for the slow learners. There has been a positive influence on attendance and achievement,

and this has carried over to the high school level. There also is a follow-up program of the project at the high school level, so that as the students leave the program from the middle school they have some contact with the program for further help. Thus it appears that there has been many changes in the district for the target group of students and that this has carried over into other areas of the curriculum.

2. Effectiveness/Success. The program is viewed as one that has been very effective and one that has met a definite need in the district. The two main objectives -- to identify needed basic survival skills and content for each student and to facilitate functional performance so that each student can be mainstreamed into the regular curriculum have been met.The project has reduced the stigma usually attached to LD special education students and has carried over to the high school level. The three SEEK identified needs have been met. The first two -- develop learning patterns based upon student needs and develop programs for potential dropouts, unmotivated students -- have been met completely. The third need --teacher training in student motivation was partially met. It is estimated that 85 per cent of the staff have accepted the program and that parental acceptance is very high. As indicated in the response to the first item above, the program has been judged as very successful and effective. Test data support this opinion as well as the complete continuation of the project.

3. Exportability. The project went into a fourth year on a dissemination grant. Thus, there was more dissemination about

this project than many other projects. Slide-tape presentations were made at both the state and national levels. Visits were made to many other school districts and others visited the project. Other districts which have used aspects of the project include Lawrence, Abilene, Heston, Buhler, Pratt, and Denver. Inquiries are still received and there have been twelve visits by staff from other schools this past year. Also, dissemination of information was done at conferences for the middle school at both the state and national levels.

4. Continued Use. All aspects and concepts of the project are currently being implemented in the district. As indicated by the assistant superintendent, 100 per cent of the program is being continued. The program and materials are used the same way as they were during federal funding, and the number of students being served has remained the same as during the last year of the program during federal funding, namely around 75 students per year. No non-public school students are involved since there is no non-public school in Russell. There is one less staff now than during federal funding since the director of the project left and was not replaced. However, there remains essentially the same teaching staff for the program.

5. Funding. Funding level for the past year was $36,250 which comes from local funds and pays for the staff and supplies. The facilities for the program are the same as during federal funding. The present level of funding compares to $48,640 during the last year of the project.

6. Factors Related to Continuation. The project director was viewed as being most influential for project continuation. However, the fact that the program was highly accepted by both the middle and high school staffs probably also was a factor in program continuation. The administration as well as the Board of Education was very positive toward the program. The project also provided assistance to the regular classroom teachers in the form of both materials and inservice training. Thus, the teachers in the regular program were in favor of continuing the project. Also regular teachers as well as project teachers were very involved in developing materials for use in the project. Thus both groups of teachers had an ownership of the materials that were developed. The principal of the middle school was also involved in the inservice training, and participated in over half of the inservice training that was provided. The only problems encountered were that during the first year of the project there were several in the community opposed to federal projects. However, by the end of the project, this was no problem as the people involved found out what could be accomplished in such a project.

7. Awareness and Use of Other Projects. Through KEDDS, local staff are familiar with projects at Leavenworth, Wichita, Hugoton, and Garden City. They became aware of these projects through personal contacts and brochures sent out by the projects and those distributed by KEDDS. However none of these projects have been implemented into the school district. Local staff

were very positive towards the ESEA Title IV-C program in Kansas. They indicate that the program is more influential than what the record indicates. Teachers are trained and are influenced by the projects and take ideas with them and continue to use them on an individual basis. Others see and use ideas but there is no record of their using these ideas or concepts. Possibly there should be more projects focused on the basics and/or remedial programs. Many teachers have good ideas and this program provides the means for implementing the ideas. Possibly an advisory board could be set up which would serve as a resource pool of ideas.

SHAWNEE MISSION - EDUCATION FOR THE SEVERELY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED AND AUTISTIC CHILD (ESED)

On-Site Procedures. Interviews were conducted with the director of federal programs, the head of special education, and one of the teachers still involved with the program. A visit was made to one of the classrooms still in operation as it was during the federal funding phase.

1. Changes in LEA. Prior to the program, the target population of special education students were not being served by any program in the district. The project provided a broad range of services for these students, services desperately needed in the district. Now both personnel in the district and parents of these children know that these children can be educated and can be taught to be functional in life. There has been some carryover to other students in the system. For example, some of the regular students were used as tutors in the program.

There was also a reduced dropout rate for emotionally disturbed students.

2. Effectiveness/Success. The project was judged to have met all three objectives: evaluate all emotionally disturbed children in the district, develop a curriculum for ED, and to develop a parent education component. Also, the identified SEEK need to strengthen programs for non-college bound students was also met according to local school administrators. Thus the local staff felt that the program was effective in meeting its objectives.

3. Exportability. Brochures are still being sent out about the project at the rate of about 200 per year. A presentation about the program was made at the National CEC convention, and staff from other districts still visit the program. It was noted that Leavenworth public schools are using concepts from the project.

4. Continued Use. According to the director of special education and the director of federal programs, all aspects of the program are being continued. There are now five teachers and six aides involved with the program compared to two teachers and two aides during the federal funding period. The program has been expanded to include art, physical education, music, and vocational education. The data base aspects of the project are still being done and has been expanded to include all PSA and LD classes. There is also an additional class at one of the junior high schools. In addition, an additional curriculum specialist is involved with the project. The same number of students are involved now in the classes that were set up during

federal funding plus six more students in the extra class that has been formed. Thus, it appears that the program has been expanded to serve more students and to offer more services than during the federal funding phase.

5. Funding. The director of special services indicated that approximately $3,000 per student is being spent to continue the program. This would be approximately $45,000 compared to $90,000 during the last year of federal funding. The present budget is from local funds and covers the teachers and aides, materials, and classrooms. Not included is busing of students and support services for these classrooms.

6. Factors Related to Continuation. Parental support for the program was very strong. There was "total acceptance" of the program by administrators, teachers, and other staff. During the federal funding period, the relationships among project staff and administrators and other teachers was said to be excellent, and both of the latter were involved in project training activities and the development of materials for use by the project. Thus it appears that the project met a need for which there was nothing provided and this appears to be one of the main reasons for continuation of the project. Parent support of the project was strong and again this relates to services being provided which did not exist before the project.

7. Awareness and Use of Other Projects. Little information was provided with either being aware of or using other projects. Some programs have been provided by KEDDS such as U-SAIL and

Right-to-Read programs out of Washington and Oregon. Currently they are looking at programs from Turner and Garden City, but have not implemented either. They have implemented U-SAIL. The district has sent administrators and teachers to look at other programs and have brought in consultants from these other programs. With regard to comments about ESEA Title IV-C in Kansas, the only comment made was that the administration of the program was excellent. The on-site visitation teams to the project were very beneficial to the projects.

SHAWNEE MISSION - Project PRODUCT

On-Site Procedures. During the on-site visit, interviews were held with the director of federal programs and three teachers who are still involved with using concepts of the project. Two classes were observed in session, and the materials that are still used in the classrooms was reviewed.

1. Changes in LEA. According to the director of federal programs there were no extensive changes in the school district due to the project. About 75 teachers in 10 of the 64 schools in the district were involved in the project during federal funding. However, there were no overall district changes due to the project. There was no data available with regard to changes in achievement, attendance, or other educational factors. Possibly there might have been an administrative change in that now there is a more formalized program for federal projects.

2. Effectiveness/Success. There is some evidence that the first objective of the project to give teachers skills to help them make more rapid and effective decisions for each student was met. It seems that those who were involved with the project did develop those skills. However there was no evidence regarding whether or not there was an improvement in student achievement. With regard to the two SEEK needs, both were met to some degree in the opinion of the director of federal programs. These were to develop learner patterns based upon student needs and to provide more effective student evaluation and assessment of achievement. However, little data was available to support these opinions.

3. Exportability. Little information was avilable as to how much dissemination was during the duration of the project during federal funding, but at the present time brochures and newsletters are available for distribution. Also an article on mainstreaming is available and notebooks about the project are being sent out. Materials from the project are still sent to teachers to use in the system.

4. Continued Use. It is estimated that about half of the teachers involved in the project are still using the materials and concepts from the project. Four of the six staff members are still in the district but have other assignments. However, they are available for conferences concerning the project and to give teachers advice who are still using project concepts. Thus, it appears that the project is being continued on an individual basis with about half of the teachers using the concepts and

about half the number of students involved now. However, the extent of the involvement may be much less than during the federal funding phase. Some teachers are still using the chart paper and other materials from the project. A list of teachers who have requested materials was available.

5. Funding. Only around $300 per year is being spent to support the printing of materials for use of teachers who want to continue using these project materials. This compares to a $90,000 budget during the last year of federal funding. There is no staff supported to continue the project and about the only support is for the printing and distribution of materials. The $300 comes from the local budget.

6. Factors Related to Continuation. It appears that there was little higher level administrative support for the project. However, the Board of Education seemed to be in favor of the project. Some principals were involved with the project, others were "cool" towards the project. Thus, administrative support at the school level was not strong. Possibly the lack of support at the cabinet level due to their not grasping the concept was one of the main factors for not continuing the project.

7. Awareness and Use of Other Projects. (See comments for the ESED Project, on pages 46 and 47.)

WICHITA - CENTER FOR INNOVATIVE TEACHING EXPERIENCES (CITE)

On-Site Procedures. During the on-site visit to the Murdock Teacher Center, interviews were held with the director of the project, four of the resource specialists still with the project, the librarian, and the secretary. The budget records and other information regarding the carry-on of the project were checked to verify continuation. Also, the files of information, the records of what materials were checked out of the library and what materials were developed were checked. The complete site was checked and it was found that the facility for the project has been expanded since federal funding, i.e., more rooms are now available for the project.

1. Changes in LEA. The following were listed as the changes brought about by Project CITE:

Individualized instruction programs.

Learner contracts.

More in-service training for teachers.

New concepts being used in schools, e.g., learning styles for students.

Focus on process of learning rather than curriculum development.

Middle school block program at 7th grade level.

Sequential model in language arts composition.

Established Murdock Teacher Center.

Production of Learner Packets.

Thus, the main changes that were brought about in the district were those associated with the Murdock Learning Center.

2. Effectiveness/Success. The effectiveness and success of the project is measured mainly in the achievements of the center in meeting the objectives set up for the center. The one main goal to establish a center for innovative and creative curriculum development was definitely met. Also it was felt that the three SEEK needs were also met: to develop learner patterns based on student needs, develop teacher in-service training to motivate students to learn, and to provide more meaningful student involvement in learning situations. Test data on students indicate that teachers who use the center have students who have increased their attitude and achievment. Approximately 75 per cent of the elementary teachers in the district had contact with the center. Around 50 non-public school teachers were involved with the project. Thus the project was effective in reaching the majority of the elementary teachers in the district.

3. Exportability. Newsletters, brochures, and a slide-tape presentation were used for disseminating information about the project. It was noted that many of the surrounding school districts are using aspects of the project or have been involved with the project in some way. The project office still gets five or six inquiries per week in the form of calls and letters from all across the country. The project office still sends out materials to other schools that were developed by the project. They have a mailing list for sending out periodic information about the project. Some of the states in which schools have used their materials include Florida, Iowa,

New York, and Indiana.

4. Continued Jse. All aspects, concepts, and materials from the project are being continued. As indicated by the director, the project is being continued at a higher level than during the federal funding period. There were 13 staff during federal funding, and now there are 16 staff members. The present involvement is the same as during federal funding with expansion into more areas of the curriculum. New teachers to the district are given an orientation to the center and how to use the facilities. The Center now does all training for the Emergency School Aid Act for junior and senior high schools. The Center trained all math aides in the district (n = 200). They do needs assessments for the district and conduct workshops on contracting. At the present time there is more teacher involvement and communication among teachers and administrative staff. Thus, the program is being continued at a higher level than it was during the federal funding phase.

5. Funding. The present funding level for the Center is $356,000 per year, compared to $131,118 during the last year of federal funding. All of these funds are from the local district with 85 per cent of the budget for salaries, the rest for supplies and materials. As indicated previously, there are now 16 staff members involved compared to only 13 during federal funding.

6. Factors Related to Continuation. The director and staff worked with the Board of Education and other administrative staff regarding continuation. Thus, project staff and satisfied teachers

were probably most influential for project continuation. Other factors related to project continuation were the high level of involvement of teachers in developing materials to use in their classrooms, the inservice training provided to regular teachers in the district, and the "make it, take it" philosophy of the Center. The administration was very supportive of the project and provided strong support. The school principals were also involved with the project and were also supportive of the project's activities. Thus it appears that the Center provided teachers a center in which they could develop relevant materials for use in their classrooms. This fact plus the excellent communication with all levels of administration were probably definite factors in the decision to continue all aspects of the project.

7. Awareness and Use of Other Projects. Since part of the KEDDS staff was housed in the same building, it is not surprising that Wichita has actively sought programs which would be a benefit to them. Some of the projects which they have used concepts from include the New Jersey Writing Program, Talents Unlimited, DEEP, and a Texas Early Childhood program. The district has been active in sending teachers to visit other projects and to try out potentially productive projects and programs. Generaly comments made about the ESEA Title IV-C program in Kansas was that this provided the funds to try out new concepts, and that the program was administered in a fair way. Local staff were pleased at having the opportunity to have the Title IV-C programs that they have had and hope to continue to work closely with the program in the future.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF ON-SITE VISITS

The information obtained from the on-site visits is summarized in the Table on Page 55. Most of the information in this Table as with other information that has been presented throughout this report represents the actual amounts for each item or is a fairly accurate estimate. In some cases actual data was not available and the information presented by the school official had to be accepted as it was presented. However, in the majority of instances actual data was available for inspection and verification. Thus, most of the information collected for this study was verified as being accurate and representative of what actually existed.

The first column of information in the Table on Page 55 presents the estimated percentage of carry-on of activities and concepts for each project. That is, this is an estimate of what proportion of the philosophy, ideas, concepts, activities, and usage of materials is presently being carried on in the district by local school staff. In some cases, this estimated percentage has no relationship with the present budget or staff involved since many project activities and concepts are being carried on by individual teachers in their regular teaching assignments and there is no need for a separate budget nor for a formal staff for this carry-on. As can be seen from the Table, half of the projects (n = 6) indicated that they are carrying on all aspects or activities of the project, and two projects indicated that project activities and concepts have greatly expanded (Colby and

PERCENTAGE CONTINUATION OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND CURRENT YEARLY FUNDING LEVELS AND STAFF/STUDENT INVOLVEMENT COMPARED TO FEDERAL FUNDING PHASE

Project	Percentage Continued	Yearly Budget ESEA	Yearly Budget Now	No. of Staff ESEA	No. of Staff Now	No. of Students ESEA	No. of Students Now
Arkansas City	25	51,276	20,000	5	0.5	60	23
Atchison	100	80,649	33,000	6.5	4	100	75
Buhler	25	40,486	0	3	0	*	*
Cherokee	60	67,514	45,000	8	**	1300	800
Colby	100+	73,000	196,000	6	22	*	*
Garden City	75	53,000	25,000	3	2	3000	125
Leavenworth	100	60,700	90,000	4	4	45	90
Ottawa	85	89,831	65,000	5.5	5.5	2490	2490
Russell	100	48,640	36,250	7	6	78	75
Shawnee Mission ESED	100	90,000	45,000	5.5	12	10	14
Shawnee Mission PRODUCT	50	90,000	300	7	0	*	*
Wichita	100+	131,118	356,000	13	16	*	*

*Difficult to determine exact number of students involved.

**Could not determine how many teachers are now involved with continuation.

Wichita). Only two of the projects had less than 50 per cent carry-on of project activities and concepts. Thus, is appears that there is a high rate of carry-on of project concepts, activities, use of materials, etc., as indicated by the local personnel interviewed and verified through actual observation or documentation through the inspection of the data available.

Another more formal indication of the degree to which projects are being continued is the amount of money being spent by the local district for continuation of program concepts and activities. The second and third columns in the Table on Page 55 present the last year's budget under ESEA funds and the current local budget for project continuation. As is indicated in this Table, three of the projects are spending more money to carry-on project activities than was spent during the last year of federal funding. Overall, for the 12 projects there was an overally yearly budget of $876,214 for these projects during the last year of federal funding, and the present budget is now $911,550, an increase overall of $35,336, or roughly 4/10ths of a per cent increase in overall total funds. However, as indicated in the Table, no local money is being spent to continue one of the projects, whereas over twice as much is now being spent to continue two of these projects.

Columns 4 and 5 in the Table on Page 55 presents information about the size of the staff during both the federal funding period and at the present time. In one case it was not possible to estimate the number of teachers continuing to use concepts of the project because the only carry-on was by

individual teachers and no records were kept of the actual number of teachers presently involved. Thus, the number of teachers who were considered as staff during federal funding and who are still using the concepts was not known. As indicated in the Table, the number of staff members currently involved in a similar way to their involvement during the federal funding phase has increased for three of the projects. For two of the projects,the number of staff directly involved has remained the same, and for two projects there was only a slight decrease in the number of staff presently involved.

The last two columns in the Table on Page 55 present estimates and in some cases the actual number of students involved with project activities during the federal funding phase and at the present time. For most projects, the number of students involved is about the same as during the federal funding phase and for one project the number of students being served has doubled.

Impressive as these figures are, the researcher was also impressed with the carry-on activity of individual teachers and the changes in philosophy and orientation that has come about due to these projects. These are factors which are often difficult to measure and often do not show up in statistical data about project carry-on. However, interviews with teachers and observations of what is being done in the classrooms in the districts that these projects were in indicate that significant changes have taken place pertinent to a renewed educational

philosophy and orientation. As one school administrator aptly stated: "...the (ESEA) program is more influential than what the record indicates. Teachers are trained and are influenced by the projects and take ideas with them and continue to use them on an individual basis. Others see and use ideas but there is no record of their using these ideas or concepts". The researcher doing this study totally agrees with the above statement.

On the basis of information collected for this study, the following conclusions seem to be warranted with regard to the variables that are operating in the respective individual and collective school district projects which would tend to indicate why some projects are deemed successful and others are considered less successful. The first factor which emerges from those projects which were deemed to be successful and which are carried on to a high degree could be entitled "involvement". Those projects which had a high degree of involvement of both teachers and administrators in planning, inservice training, and development of materials tended to be judged more successful and were continued to a greater degree. Those projects which involved teachers in material development in which teachers could develop materials for use in their classrooms were rated as most successful. The "teacher make, teacher take" philosophy of some projects resulted in the development of materials which were highly relevant to classroom needs. Involvement of administrators in project activities including inservice training was also a factor of successful projects that were carried on to a

high degree. Thus, administrator involvement and support was an important factor with regard to carry-on of project activities. The second factor would be entitled "cooperation". Those projects which had a high degree of cooperation among staff, teachers, and administrators were judged more successful and were carried on more than the other projects. Close working relationships is closely related to this cooperation, i.e., all staff working cooperatively together to solve a problem or meet a need. The third factor which emerges is "assistance". Those projects which provided relevant inservice training, materials that were needed by teachers, and other help which teachers deemed to be beneficial to them were rated as being successful and had a high degree of carry-on. This is related to what some have called the "grass roots" approach -- providing meaningful help and materials to the classroom teacher. Another factor would be "communication". Those projects which emphasized communication of what the project was doing with their regular staff, with the administration, and with the Board of Education were judged to be successful and had a high level of continuation. Other factors which seemed to be important for some projects were local staff being supportive of the project and in favor of its being continued. Continuous training for teachers with follow-up to help with implementation problems rather than a massive inservice training effort at the beginning of the project and little follow-up of how teachers were doing. Having an effective director of the project who could communicate with and get along with both the regular staff and the school admin-

istration. Finally, the practicality of the project and its relevancy to district needs were important with regard to whether or not a project was considered successful and if it was continued.

Those factors which seem to emerge from those projects which were not deemed successful and which were not carried on to a great extent were as follows. Those projects which seemed to be isolated from the regular school program and which had few contacts with the regular program were deemed not to be very successful and tended not to be continued. This is closely related to communication procedures between project staff and regular staff. If this close relationship was not evident, then the projects tended not to be accepted. Likewise little or no input into project planning or activities also created a situation in which the project was not considered as being successful. A lack of high level support at the superintendent or Board level was also a factor important regarding lack of carry-on and not feeling that the project was successful. Also, a lack of local school administrative involvement at the principal level also was an important factor. Finally, philosophical differences between project staff and regular staff was a factor in several cases in which projects were thought not to be successful and thus were not continued.

RESULTS FROM MAILED QUESTIONNAIRE

A total of 1500 questionnaires were mailed to all elementary, junior high, and senior high school principals in the State of Kansas in May, 1979. Each questionnaire was mailed with directions for its completion. A return envelope was provided. The questionnaire used in this survey can be found in Appendix A.

A total of 407 responses, or 27 percent, were returned. This number represents 407 separate schools and includes those respondants who were unfamiliar with the projects, those who were familiar with the projects but not implementing any concepts from the projects, and those who were engaged in implementing concepts from the projects.

The questionnaire was organized in two parts. The first part requested information on the principals' familiarity with, and utilization of the 12 Title IV-C projects included in this survey. Each of the 12 projects, with identifying descriptors and location, were listed separately. Following each project name were six (6) blank spaces which the principals were requested to fill in. The first two spaces were reserved for information on their familiarity with the projects, and whether or not they, or any of their staff, had made visits to the projects. The last four spaces requested information on building level implementation of the projects, and asked principals who had implemented projects to indicate

a. the number of teachers in the building involved in using each of the projects,

b. the number of students involved in each of the projects,

c. the school budget for each of the projects, and;

d. for each project the concept being used.

The table on the following page summarizes the responses to the first two questions on the survey--principals' familiarity with projects and on-site visits made to projects. The first column identifies the project. The second and third columns indicate the number of building principals who were familiar with the projects, and who, or whose staff made visits to the projects. For example, 25 building principals were familiar with the TAPS project in Arkansas City. Of that number five (5) principals, or their staff, made on-site visits to the project.

The total in the first column shows 555 checked responses to the question concerning project familiarity. The survey was designed to allow principals to check the number of projects with which they were familiar. Thus principals could check none, one, or all 12 projects. Of the 407 returned surveys, 134 building principals indicated that they were <u>not</u> familiar with any of the projects. From these 134 responses it can be determined that the 555 checked responses represent 273 schools.

Table two summarizes the responses to questions three-through-five of the survey concerning building level implementation of the concepts from the projects. The first column again identifies the project. The second column, titled "N", indicates the actual number of schools using

RESULTS FROM MAILED QUESTIONNAIRE

A total of 1500 questionnaires were mailed to all elementary, junior high, and senior high school principals in the State of Kansas in May, 1979. Each questionnaire was mailed with directions for its completion. A return envelope was provided. The questionnaire used in this survey can be found in Appendix A.

A total of 407 responses, or 27 percent, were returned. This number represents 407 separate schools and includes those respondants who were unfamiliar with the projects, those who were familiar with the projects but not implementing any concepts from the projects, and those who were engaged in implementing concepts from the projects.

The questionnaire was organized in two parts. The first part requested information on the principals' familiarity with, and utilization of the 12 Title IV-C projects included in this survey. Each of the 12 projects, with identifying descriptors and location, were listed separately. Following each project name were six (6) blank spaces which the principals were requested to fill in. The first two spaces were reserved for information on their familiarity with the projects, and whether or not they, or any of their staff, had made visits to the projects. The last four spaces requested information on building level implementation of the projects, and asked principals who had implemented projects to indicate

a. the number of teachers in the building involved in using each of the projects,

b. the number of students involved in each of the projects,

c. the school budget for each of the projects, and;

d. for each project the concept being used.

The table on the following page summarizes the responses to the first two questions on the survey--principals' familiarity with projects and on-site visits made to projects. The first column identifies the project. The second and third columns indicate the number of building principals who were familiar with the projects, and who, or whose staff made visits to the projects. For example, 25 building principals were familiar with the TAPS project in Arkansas City. Of that number five (5) principals, or their staff, made on-site visits to the project.

The total in the first column shows 555 checked responses to the question concerning project familiarity. The survey was designed to allow principals to check the number of projects with which they were familiar. Thus principals could check none, one, or all 12 projects. Of the 407 returned surveys, 134 building principals indicated that they were <u>not</u> familiar with any of the projects. From these 134 responses it can be determined that the 555 checked responses represent 273 schools.

Table two summarizes the responses to questions three-through-five of the survey concerning building level implementation of the concepts from the projects. The first column again identifies the project. The second column, titled "N", indicates the actual number of schools using

the project. The third column shows the number of teachers using each of the projects. The fourth column indicates the number of students involved in those projects, and the fifth column lists the combined budgets for the schools that reported.

From this table it can be seen that the PIC project is being implemented in six schools; that within those six schools, 130 teachers are teaching concepts from the project to 476 students. Only one of the six principals who responded reported a budget which totaled $120. Concepts from Project CITE are being implemented in more schools than any other project. Thirty-eight schools involving 494 teachers are using aspects of this project in teaching 7389 students. Only six of the 38 schools using Project CITE reported budget figures which totaled $2705.

The combined totals regarding the numbers of schools, teachers, and students shows that of the 407 responses, concepts from the projects are being implemented in 100 schools, and that a total of 975 teachers and 13,202 students were reported as being involved in some way.

Table three summarizes the responses to the sixth question on the survey by listing the different concepts from the projects which are being used by the reporting schools. Again the first column lists the projects' names. The second column lists the number of schools implementing the project. The third column lists the concepts from the project being used, and for each separate concept, the number of schools that reported.

TABULATIONS FROM RETURNED QUESTIONNAIRES

TABLE I PART I

QUESTIONS ONE AND TWO

PROJECT	FAMILIAR WITH PROJECT	VISITED PROJECT
	N	N
TAPS, Arkansas City	25	5
PROJECT PACE, Atchison	43	8
PIC, Buhler	34	9
GLAD, Cherokee	32	8
NKEC, Colby	53	22
PROJECT MASTER, Garden City	37	9
STAY, Leavenworth	43	11
SPICE, Ottawa	68	17
SCORE, Russell	52	19
PRODUCT, Shawnee Mission	45	22
ESED, Shawnee Mission	36	9
CITY, Wichita	97	49
TOTAL	555	188

TABULATIONS FROM RETURNED QUESTIONNAIRES

TABLE II PART I
QUESTIONS THREE-THROUGH-FIVE

PROJECT	N	#Teachers Using	#Students Involved	Budget
TAPS, Arkansas City	1	2	15	
PROJECT PACE, Atchison	2	7	2	
PIC, Buhler	6	130	476	$120/1
GLAD, Cherokee	3	15	310	$100/1

Table II, Part I (Cont.)

PROJECT	N	#Teachers Using	#Students Involved	Budget
NKEC, Colby	11	177	1911	$51,500/3
PROJECT MASTER, Garden City	3	2	24	
STAY, Leavenworth	4	5	96	6,200/2
SPICE, Ottawa	9	62	947	
SCORE, Russell	6	29	258	28,000/1
PRODUCT, Shawnee Mission	14	49	1758	25/1
ESED, Shawnee Mission	3	3	16	
CITE, Wichita	38	494	7389	2,705/6
TOTAL	100	975	13,202	

TABULATIONS FROM RETURNED QUESTIONNAIRES

TABLE III PART I

QUESTION SIX

PROJECT	N	Concept Utilized
TAPS, Arkansas City	1	Not reported
PROJECT PACE, Atchison	2	Teaching methods/1
PIC, Buhler	6	Piaget's theories/1
GLAD, Cherokee	3	Student reading awareness/1
NKEC, Colby	11	Special educational services/3 Gifted/1 Materials/3
PROJECT MASTER, Garden City	3	Methods/1 Probability/1
STAY, Leavenworth	4	Alternative school/2
SPICE, Ottawa	9	Materials/1 Career education/1

Table III, Part I (Cont.)

PROJECT	N	Concept Utilized
SCORE, Russell	6	Reading/1 Materials/1 Learning Styles/1 Evaluation/1 Individualization/1
PRODUCT, Shawnee Mission	14	Continuous measurement/1 Individualized math/1 Charting/3
ESED, Shawnee Mission	3	PSA/1
CITE, Wichita	38	ALP/1 Inservice Training/2 Math/3 Reading/2 Innovative teaching/5 Individualized instruction/2 Materials construction/3 Conflict Management/1

The second part of the questionnaire requested those principals not using any of the concepts from the 12 Title IV-C projects to indicate their reasons for not doing so. The following is a summary of the responses to this question. The responses are listed in order of frequency, with the most mentioned items first.

139 Not aware of the project or have too little information about the project to implement. A number of principals indicated that they were new to the state and did not know about the former projects.

30 Limited budget, personnel, resources, or time.

19 Locally developed projects and/or teachers are meeting student needs.

15 Projects do not meet student's needs.

12 No interest in implementing these projects.

8 Projects are too far from the local school to learn about.

5 No opportunity to implement the projects.

3 No authority to implement the projects.

2 Have adopted other projects

2 Do not agree with the concept of special projects. Opposed to federal programs for public schools.

1 New School

The results of this mailed questionnaire show that of the four-hundred-seven (407) returns, 100 building principals in Kansas are currently engaged in implementing concepts from the 12 past Title IV-C projects. One-hundred-thirty-four were unfamiliar with any of these projects. These two figures show that 173 respondants were familiar with some or all of the projects, but were not implementing any of them.

APPENDIX

ESEA TITLE IV-c IMPACT STUDY PROJECT & SCHOOL _____

1. What changes were brought about in your school district as a result of your _____ Project?

2. How effective do you view the _____ Project in meeting the objectives of that project, that is, meeting the objectives:

_____

_____

3. Listed below are the Kansas identified learner needs which your project focused on. Were any of these met and to what extent?

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. What other changes were brought about due to the project? (Attendance rates, ach. levels, dropout rates, etc.)

5. How many public and non-public teachers were trained by the project?

   Public _____ Non-Public _____

6. How many students were involved:

   Public _____ Non-Public _____

7. Were others influenced by that project? If yes, describe.

8. What type of teacher training was used during the implementation of the project?

   Were teachers paid for the training they received? _____

   Was training continuous over a period of time,
   or was it mainly at the beginning of the project?

   Were outside consultants used for training? To what extent?

9. Do you know what kind of classroom assistance was provided by the project or the district staff for the project?

10. Were there opportunities for project staff and/or teachers to visit other similar projects in other school districts? Do you recall how many trips and who made the visits?

11. Were materials used by the project purchased or developed locally?

12. What kind and how much involvement did the principal have during the duration of the project?

    Did the principal participate in project training activities? If yes, how extensive was his participation?

    Was the principal supportive of the project?

13. What were the relationships among project staff, teachers, and the administration during the duration of the project?

    Did teachers have an opportunity to participate in the decision making process for the project? (Application, Implementation, and/or Project Continuation)

    Were there any problems, such as some teachers or groups not wanting to be involved with the project?

14. Do you feel that the project director was effective in implementing the project?

    Was he able to work with teachers, staff, and administration?

    Did he do a good job of "selling the project"?

15. Were there any groups or teachers who were notably very enthusiastic about the project?

    Were there any who were notably not in favor of the project?

16. How would you describe the administration's view of the project?

    Were there any local political and/or organizational concerns about the project?

17. How much dissemination was done concerning your project?

18. Do you know of any other school districts using aspects of that project? If yes, which districts and which aspects?

19. Do you still get inquiries from other school districts about that project? If yes, how many and from what schools?

20. Which aspects or concepts of that project are currently being implemented in your district?

21. What percent of the project is being continued?

22. How many staff members are still involved in continuing project activities? _____

How does this compare with the size of the staff during the duration of the project?

Is the present involvement of these people similar to their involvement during the duration of the project? How is it different?

23. How many students are currently involved in continuation activities?

How does this compare with the number of students involved during the duration of the project?

24. Do you know if any non-public schools are continuing any aspects of the project? If yes, describe.

# of teachers involved _____ # of students _____

25. Are project materials still being used in your district? If yes, describe what is being used.

26. What is the level of funding being spent on project continuation? $ _____

What is the source of continuation funds?

27. Who had the most influence for the project's continuation?

28. What were the major problems that you encountered in continuing to implement that project?

29. What were the reasons for not continuing to use all of the aspects of that project?

30. Are you familiar with other Title IV-c Projects? If yes, which ones?

31. How did you become aware of these projects?

32. Have you or any of your staff made on-site visits to any of these projects? If yes, which projects?

33. Has your district implemented any concepts or aspects of these projects? If yes, what is being implemented and to what extent?

34. What comments do you have concerning the ESEA Title IV-c program in the State of Kansas.

INSTRUCTIONS: Listed below are descriptions and the names of the 12 ESEA Title IV-c projects being considered in this study. In the first column, please check those projects that you are familiar with. In the second column, check those projects that you or someone from your staff has made an on-site visit to. If you have implemented any of the concepts of these projects, please indicate the number of teachers who have used that concept in your school, the number of students that were involved, the budget required to implement that concept, and a brief description of which aspect or concept of that project you used in your school.
If you have not implemented any of the projects, please state the reasons for not using any of these concepts in the space provided on the other side of this survey form. Thank you.

			If you have implemented any of these projects:			
PROJECT IDENTIFICATION	Familiar with Project	Visited Project	No. of Teachers Using	No. of Students Involved	Budget	Concepts utilized from Project
Teenage Parents School, TAPS, Arkansas City	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Education for handicapped students - Personal and Career Exploration Project, PACE, Atchison	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Educational theory in practice - Piaget in the Classroom, PIC, Buhler	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Communication skills - Goal: Language Arts Development, GLAD, Cherokee	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Northwest Kansas Educ. Cooperative, NKEC, Colby	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Computer approach to science and math - Project MASTER, Garden City	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

(Please continue on other side)

PROJECT IDENTIFICATION	Familiar with Project	Visited Project	If you have implemented any of these projects: No. of Teachers Using	No. of Students Involved	Budget	Concept utlized from Project
Alternatives for high school drop-outs - Second Time Around for Youth, STAY, Leavenworth						
Career Education in the School Curriculum, SPICE, Ottawa						
Special help for low achievers - Sharing Concern and Opportunities for Relevant Education, SCORE, Russell						
Pinpointing Individual Needs, PRODUCT, Shawnee Mission						
Education for the Severely Emotionally Disturbed and Autistic Child, ESED, Shawnee Mission						
Center for Innovative Teaching Experiences, CITE, Wichita						

If you have not implemented any of the concepts or aspects of these 12 projects, please state the reasons for not using any of these projects. Thank you.

_____

_____

_____

Please return to L. Havlicek, School of Education, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan. 66045

THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

School of Education
Bailey Hall
Lawrence, Kansas 66045

May 14, 1979

To: All School Principals in Kansas

The University of Kansas has been contracted by the Kansas State Department of Education to determine the impact that Title IV-c, ESEA Projects have had on education in the State. Since 1965 funds have been awarded under guidelines of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for proposed projects to develop innovative solutions to educational problems.

Since the beginning of ESEA funding, 57 projects have been completed in the State of Kansas. The purpose of this study is to determine the impact of 12 recently completed projects. Part of this contracted study is to determine how many educators in Kansas are aware of these projects, have visited these projects, and how many are using aspects or concepts of these projects.

The enclosed survey form is being sent to all principals in the State. Your cooperation in assisting us to determine the impact of these 12 projects will be appreciated. It should only take a few minutes to complete the survey form and return it in the self-addressed, postage paid envelope enclosed.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Larry L. Havlicek

Dr. Larry L. Havlicek
Professor of Education

Main Campus, Lawrence
College of Health Sciences and Hospital, Kansas City and Wichita